

REMARKS

Claims 53-112 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-52 were previously cancelled, and claims 92-111 were previously added. Claim 112 has been added, and claims 53, 73 and 92 have been amended herewith. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 53-54, 56-59, 65-66, 68-69, 92, 93, 95-98, 104, 105, 107 and 108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang (U.S. Patent No. 6,943,294, hereinafter "Kang") in view of Chia (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0227079, hereinafter "Chia") and Heng (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0045378, hereinafter "Heng").

Claims 55, 70-78, 84-85, 87-91, 94 and 109-111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view of Chia, Heng, and Lo (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0160312, hereinafter "Lo").

Claims 60-64 and 99-103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view of Chia and Heng as applied to claims 53, 56 and 92 above, and further in view of Itoh (U.S. Patent No. 4,439,841, hereinafter "Itoh").

Claims 67 and 106 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view of Chia and Heng as applied to claims 53 and 66 above, and further in view of Lin (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0126927, hereinafter "Lin").

Claims 79-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view of Chia, Heng, and Lo and further in view of Itoh.

Claim 86 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view of Chia, Heng, and Lo and further in view of Lin.

However, each of the independent claims 53, 73 and 92 have been amended to include limitations such that these claims do now patentably define over all of the references of record whether considered singly or in combination and are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

More specifically, the independent claims now require *each* one of the multiplicity of the re-routing lines to extend between the bond pads at the interior region to the re-routed bond pads at the periphery region of the chip without intermediate connection. This is a different structure than disclosed by Chia wherein the conducting line traveling from one side of the center line to the other peripheral includes an intermediate connection to the adjoining chip before extending to the peripheral bond pads. It is also different from the newly cited Heng reference where only the single line 531f is without an intermediate connection. Thus, it is clear that none of the Kang, Chia or Heng references teach that *each* one of the multiplicity of lines must be without an intermediate connection.

In addition, none of the other references Itoh, Lo or Lin overcome the shortcomings of Kang, Chia or Heng and therefore each of the dependent claims is also believed allowable for depending from a claim deemed allowable as well as for its own limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone James C. Kesterson, Applicants' attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

25 October 2007
Date

James C. Kesterson
James C. Kesterson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 25,882

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218